UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,601	08/18/2003	John R. Hind	RSW920030079US1 (099)	5066

46320 7590 07/27/2007

CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER	
TURNER, ASHLEY D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/643,601	HIND ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ashley D. Turner	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/18/2003.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims, 2,8,12,14,20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 2 line 3 " a requesting browser" applicants should change correction to –said requesting browser – to improve the clarity of the claim language.

In claim 8 line 5 " said supplemental content" applicants should change correction to – a supplemental content – to improve the clarity of the claim language.

In claim 12 line 3 " a portion of a reference" applicants should change correction to – one of said references – to improve the clarity of the claim language.

In claim 14 line 3 " a requesting browser" applicants should change correction to –said requesting browser – to improve the clarity of the claim language.

In claim 20 line 6 "said encoded string" applicants should change correction to – an encoded string – to improve the clarity of the claim language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) The invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1,9,10,11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Wolfe et al hereinafter Wolfe (US 6,397,246).

Referring to claim 1, a method for circumventing the operation of content blocking logic in a markup language document delivery system, the method comprising the steps of: determining the operation of content blocking logic i.e. webpage; locating in markup a reference to content (Col.1 lines 37-40); replacing in said markup said reference with an alias i.e. substitute file (Abstract lines 5-11); and, serving said markup to a requesting browser (Col. 1 lines 37-49); whereby said replacement with said alias circumvents the operation of said content blocking logic(Abstract lines 9-13).

Claims 9 and 13 are likewise rejected using the same reasoning and citations for claim 1 since they recite identical limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

Referring to Claim 10, Wolfe discloses all of the limitations of claim 10 which is described above. Wolfe also discloses a system "wherein said variable aliasing logic is communicatively coupled to a reverse proxy server" (Col 3 lines 40-44).

Referring to claim 11, further comprising an alias table comprising a plurality of entries, each entry correlating an alias with corresponding content (Col. 2 lines 49-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.Claims 2,7,8,14,19,20, is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolfe (US 6,397,246) and in view of Iwamoto (US 5,715,462).

Referring to claim 2, Wolfe discloses all the limitations of claim 1 which is described above. Wolfe also discloses "serving said markup with said new alias to a requesting browser" (Col. 1 lines 37-49). However, Wolfe did not disclose "subsequent to said serving step, replacing said alias with a new alias". The general concept of "subsequent to said serving step, replacing said alias with a new alias" is well known in the art as

taught by Iwamoto. Iwamoto discloses subsequent to said serving step, replacing said alias with a new alias (Col. 5 lines 45 –55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wolf to include subsequent to said serving step, replacing said alias with a new alias in order to provide proper updating and restoration of a system file.

Claim 14 is likewise rejected using the same reasoning and citations for claim 2 since they recite identical limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

Referring to claim 7 Wolfe discloses the all the limitations of claim 7 which is described above. Wolfe did not disclose, "formulating said alias from said reference; and, replacing said reference with said alias." The general concept of "formulating said alias from said reference; and, replacing said reference with said alias is well known in the art as taught by Iwamoto. Iwamoto discloses formulating said alias i.e. substitute file from said reference i.e. system files; and replacing said reference with said alias (Abstract lines 4-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wolfe to include formulating said alias from said reference; and, replacing said reference with said alias in order to provide backup files for the original file in the event the original file is corrupted.

Claims 19 are likewise rejected using the same reasoning and citations for claim 7 since they recite identical limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

Referring to claim 8, Wolfe discloses encoding a string based upon a uniform resource identifier (URI) in said reference (Col.2 lines 50-57); interspersing at least one file system delimiter in said encoded string to generate a simulated path to said supplemental content (Col.2 lines 33-40); combining a network address for a local file system with said simulated path (Col.2 lines 33-40); and, recording said simulated path and a correlation to said reference in an alias table for use when de-referencing said URI into said simulated path(Col.4 lines lines 20-26) and (Col. 8 lines 35-40). Wolfe did not disclose formulating said alias from said reference; and, replacing said reference with said alias. The general concept of formulating said alias from said reference; and, replacing said reference with said alias is well known in the art as taught by Iwamoto. Iwamoto discloses formulating said alias i.e. substitute file from said reference i.e. system files; and replacing said reference with said alias (Abstract lines 4-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wolfe to include formulating said alias from said reference; and, replacing said reference with said alias in order to provide backup files for the original file in the event the original file is corrupted.

Claim 20 is likewise rejected using the same reasoning and citations for claim 8 since they recite identical limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

6. Claim 3,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolfe (US 6,397,246) and in view of Beaumont (US 2002/0169890 A1).

Referring to claim 3 Wolfe discloses all the limitations of claim 3 which is described above. Wolfe also discloses wherein said new alias is selected from a set of aliases (Col. 2 lines 15 –20). Wolfe did not disclose in a round- robin manner. The general concept of having a set of aliases in a round robin manner is well known in the art as taught by Beaumont. Beaumont discloses a set of aliases in a round robin manner ([0004] lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wolfe to include a set of aliases in a round robin manner in order to allow data to hop from one device to another until it reaches its destination.

Claim 15 is likewise rejected using the same reasoning and citations for claim 3 since they recite identical limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

7. Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolfe (US 6,397,246) and in view of www.acky.net/html/meta.sht "How to insert META tags."

Referring to claim 4 Wolfe discloses all the limitations of claim 4 which is described above. Wolfe also discloses performing said locating, replacing and serving steps with a new alias (Col .2 lines 15- 25). Wolfe did not disclose inserting a refresh tag in said markup to command a refreshing of said markup with in a shortened period of time. The general concept of inserting a refresh tag in said markup to command a refreshing of said markup with a shortened period of time is well known in the art as taught by " How to insert META tags". The article "How to insert META tags" discloses steps on how to insert a refresh tag using META tags. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include inserting a refresh tag in said markup to command a refreshing of said markup with shortened period of time in order to allow the web browser to automatically refresh the current page.

Claim 16 is likewise rejected using the same reasoning and citations for claim 4 since they recite identical limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

8. Claim 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolfe (US 6,397,246) in view of Cai (US2004/0172468 A1) and further in view of Prabhakar (US 2005/0010662 A1).

Referring to Claim 5, Wolfe discloses all the limitations of claim 5 which are described above. Wolfe did not disclose "wherein said determining step comprises the steps of: tracking a number of references to content disposed in said markup; further tracking a number of requests for content produced when rendering said markup; and, determining that content blocking has occurred when a difference between said references and said requests exceeds a threshold value." The general concept of tracking a number of references to content disposed in said markup; further tracking a number of requests for content produced when rendering said markup is well known in the art taught by Cai. Cai discloses tracking a number of references to content disposed in said markup [0017] [0028]; further tracking a number of requests for content produced when rendering said markup [0017] [0028]; . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wolfe by Cali to include the limitation "tracking a number of references to content disposed in said markup; further tracking a number of requests for content produced when rendering said markup" in order to provide security protection unit that protects the underlying computer system from unauthorized intrusion resulting from redirection of applications as they process in the multi-application environment.

Although the modified teachings of Wolfe shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they further fail to expressly disclose. "determining that content blocking has

occurred when a difference between said references and said requests exceeds a threshold value."

Nevertheless, "determining that content blocking has occurred when a difference between said references and said requests exceeds a threshold" was well known in the art at the time of the claim invention. In a similar field of endeavor, Prabhakar teaches, "determining that content blocking has occurred when a difference between said references and said requests exceeds a threshold" [0042]. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Wolfe by Prabhakar to include the limitations of "determining that content blocking has occurred when a difference between said references and said requests exceeds a threshold value." as taught by Prabhakar in order to provide security protection unit that protects the underlying computer system from unauthorized intrusion resulting from redirection of applications as they process in the multi-application environment.

9. Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolfe (US 6,397,246) in view of Prabhakar (US 2005/0010662 A1).

Referring to Claim 6 Wolfe discloses all the limitations of claim 6 which are described above. Wolfe did not disclose 'wherein said determining step comprises the steps of: statistically tracing instances of served content; and, determining that content blocking has occurred when a particular one of said served content has not been served as often

as indicated by said statistical tracking." The general concept of statistically tracking instances of served content; and, determining that content blocking has occurred when a particular one of said served content has not been served as often as indicated by said statistical tracking is well known in the art as taught by Prabhakar. Prabhakar discloses the limitations of statistically tracing instances of served content; and, determining that content blocking has occurred when a particular one of said served content has not been served as often as indicated by said statistical tracking [0043]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wolfe by Prabhakar to include the limitation determining that content blocking has occurred when a particular one of said served content has not been served as often as indicated by said statistical tracking in order to provide security protection unit that protects the underlying computer system from unauthorized intrusion resulting from redirection of applications as they process in the multi-application environment.

10. Claim 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolfe (US 6,397,246) in view of Omoigui (US 6,694,352 B1).

Referring to claim 12 Wolfe discloses all the limitations of claim 12 which is described above. Wolfe also discloses a formulator having a configuration for generating a simulated path i.e. URL to supplemental content (Col 9. lines 15-21). Wolfe did not disclose an address encoder having logic for producing an encoded string based upon at least a portion of a reference, a simulated path formulator coupled to said encoder,

and, a translation table configured to store said simulated path and at lest a portion of said reference. The general concept of an address encoder having logic for producing an encoded string based upon at least a portion of a reference is well known in the art as taught by Khanna. Khanna discloses an address encoder having logic for producing an encoded string based upon at least a portion of a reference (Col. 2 lines 47-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wolfe by Khanna to include the limitation "an address encoder having logic for producing an encoded string based upon at least a portion of a reference" in order to provide security protection unit that protects the underlying computer system from unauthorized intrusion resulting from redirection of applications as they process in the multi-application environment.

Although the modified teachings of Wolfe shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they further fail to expressly disclose. "a simulated path formulator coupled to said encoder, a translation table configured to store said simulated path and at least a portion of said reference."

Nevertheless, "a simulated path formulator coupled to said encoder, a translation table configured to store said simulated path and at least a portion of said reference" was well known in the art at the time of the claimed invention. In a similar field of endeavor, Omoigui teaches: "a simulated path formulator i.e. URL coupled to said encoder, a

translation table i.e. database configured to store said simulated path and at least a portion of said reference i.e. presentation" (Col. 10 lines 32-43). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Wolfe by Omoigui to include the limitation "a simulated path formulator coupled to said encoder, a translation table configured to store said simulated path and at least a portion of said reference" in order to provide security protection unit that protects the underlying computer system from unauthorized intrusion resulting from redirection of applications as they process in the multi-application environment.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashley d. Turner whose telephone number is 571-270-1603. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 7:30a.m. - 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-2603.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Patent Examiner: Supervisory Patent Examiner

Ashley Turner

Date: 5/29/07

Nathan Flynn

Date: _____